



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1430  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/276,233	03/25/1999	TALAL G. SHAMOON	07451.0011-0	1836

22852 7590 09/11/2003

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER  
LLP  
1300 I STREET, NW  
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER

SANTOS, PATRICK J D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2171

DATE MAILED: 09/11/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/276,233

Applicant(s)

SHAMOON ET AL.

Examiner

Patrick J Santos

Art Unit

2171

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 March 1999.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 8-21 and 23-25 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7, 22 and 26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 25 March 1999 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 9.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Election/Restrictions***

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 USC 121:

- I. Claims 1-7, 22, and 26 drawn to a streaming media player method and apparatus providing content protection and digital rights management for Media Player, classified in class 709, subclass 231 "Computer to Computer Data Streaming."
- II. Claims 8-16, drawn to a control arrangement containing a rule or rule set associated with governance of a sub-stream or object, classified in class 705, subclass 51 "Usage protection of distributed data files."
- III. Claims 23-25 drawn to an encoding process for a bit stream, classified in class 710, subclass 1 "Input/Output Data Processing."

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions I and II; II and III; and I and III are related as combination and subcombination. Inventions in this relationship are distinct if it can be shown that (1) the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed for patentability, and (2) that the subcombination has utility by itself or in other combinations (MPEP § 806.05(c)).

Regarding inventions I and II, the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed because invention I described the internals of a streaming media player with a control arrangement providing for the means to control access to the playing media. The control arrangement need not be used strictly by a rule set, but could be used by a user interface, or another application, separate from digital rights management. The subcombination of invention II has separate utility in that a usage rights rule engine need not be applied strictly to a streaming media player, but to an arbitrary application.

Regarding inventions II and III, the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed because invention II describes a way to specify access rights to data via rules. These rules apply to an arbitrary data payload of the bit stream, and thus are distinct from any special format of the bit stream. The subcombination of invention III has separate utility in that the bit stream, and the means to encode it is specific to a data provider, independent of the transport used to send the data to clients.

Regarding inventions I and III, the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed because invention I describes a streaming media player that can receive, decode, and render data from a client perspective. On the other hand, the subcombination of invention III has separate utility in that the bit stream, and the means to encode it is specific to a data provider from a server perspective, independent of the client used to render the data.

Art Unit: 2171

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above, and the search required for Groups I, II, and III are mutually exclusive, restriction for examination purposed as indicated is proper.

During a telephone conversation with Ms. Karna Nisewaner on 04 September 2003, a provisional election was made without traverse to prosecute the invention of Group I, Claims 1-7, 22, 26. Affirmation of this election must be made by applicant in replying to this Office action. Claims 8-21, and 23-25 are withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

### ***Drawings***

The drawings are objected to because of the following minor informalities: Top and left margins are insufficient, some figures have improper shading, and some figures are missing prior art labels, and one figure appears to have a typographic error.

All figures have insufficient top and left margins. Please refer to the PTO-948 Draftsman's Review form for more information.

Figures 21 and 22 have shading. Please refer to the PTO-948 Draftsman's Review form for more information.

Figures 13, 14, and 16 should be designated by a legend such as --Prior Art-- because only that which is old is illustrated. See MPEP § 608.02(g).

Figures 2 and 5 appear not to be in agreement. Specifically, Figure 2 indicates the order of data in a header is "Header Identifier", "Stream Type", "ES\_ID", "Time Stamp", "Governance Indicator", and "Packet Length." However, in Figure 5, and the description in the specification (page 9, line 10-18), shows a different order: "Header Identifier", "Stream Type", "ID Field", "Pointers to ES\_IDs", "Packet Length", and "Time Stamp."

A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

#### ***Information Disclosure Statement***

The information disclosure statements received August 16, 1999 and December 20, 2001 are both objected to.

The aforementioned information disclosure statements fail to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(2), which requires a legible copy of each U.S. and foreign patent; each publication or that portion which caused it to be listed; and all other information or that portion which caused it to be listed.

Furthermore, the aforementioned information disclosure statements fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(3) because they does not include a concise explanation of the relevance, as it is presently understood by the individual designated in 37 CFR 1.56(c) most knowledgeable about the content of the information, of each patent listed that is not in the English language.

The aforementioned information disclosure statements have been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered.

### ***Specification***

This application does not contain an abstract of the disclosure as required by 37 CFR 1.72(b). An abstract on a separate sheet is required.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was

Art Unit: 2171

not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1-6, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,875,303 issued to Huizer et al. (Huizer '303) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,852,664 issued to Iverson et al. (Iverson '664) and in further view of, "MPEG-4 Intellectual Property Management & Protection (IPMP) Overview & Applications Document," by Lacy, Rump, and Kudumakis 1998 (Lacy '98).

Regarding Claim 1, Huizer '303 teaches a streaming media player (column 6, lines 58-59; Huizer '303), that has a port able to read a bit stream (column 6, lines 60-61; Huizer '303), and a control arrangement (column 6, line 66 to column 7 line 17; Huizer '303), all of which are limitations recited by pending Claim 1.

Huizer '303 does not teach content protection or Digital Rights Management (DRM) in the streaming media player where the receiving port is able to read a bit stream that is encrypted in part, and has a container holding control information including a cryptographic key; and where the control arrangement is able to extract the cryptographic key and decrypt the encrypted bit stream. Moreover, Huizer '303 does not explicitly contemplate the adding DRM capabilities to the disclosed streaming media player.

However, Iverson '664 explicitly teaches a receiving port (column 7, lines 23-29; Iverson '664), where the incoming bit stream is encrypted in part, and contains a key



Art Unit: 2171

(column 7, lines 1-9 and column 7, lines 23-51; Iverson '664); and the control arrangement is able to extract the key and decrypt the bit stream (column 7, line 47 to column 8, line 2; Iverson '664).

Additionally, Lacy '98 explicitly teaches the adding of DRM capabilities, streaming media players. (page 1, lines 3-11; Lacy '98).

To incorporate the addition of DRM capabilities as taught by Lacy '98, and as disclosed by Iverson '664 to the streaming media player of Huizer '303, would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention by the applicant as the combination of the same is inherently necessary and explicitly taught therein as will be demonstrated below.

The motivation to add DRM capabilities to the streaming media player of Huizer '303 is suggested by Lacy '98 positing the requirement on tools for multimedia bit streams, (page 1, lines 1-2; Lacy '98) that "... managed information has great value to its creator and/or distributors requiring high-grade management and protection mechanisms" (page 1, lines 6-8; Lacy '98). In particular, one would have been motivated to apply the mechanism as taught by Iverson '664, in which an encrypted stream contains a key that the decoder can extract to decrypt the stream (column 7, line 23 to column 8, line 2; Iverson '664), to the streaming media player of Huizer '303, since Lacy '98 explicitly teaches this methods of this type for the addition of DRM capabilities to a streaming media player (page 4, lines 17-22; Lacy '98). As such, it would have been obvious and necessary to add DRM capabilities as taught by Lacy '98, as

disclosed by Iverson '664, to the streaming media player of Huizer '303. Thus Claim 1 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a).

Regarding Claim 2, Huizer '303, Iverson '664, and Lacy '98 teach all the limitations of Claim 1 as described above.

Additionally, Huizer '303 teaches an embodiment of a streaming media player that incorporates a demultiplexer (demux) (column 6, lines 60-65; Huizer '303), a decompression unit (column 5, line 66; Huizer '303), and a rendering unit (column 6, lines 55-57; Huizer '303) which are limitations recited by Claim 2. Specifically, disclosed invention of Huizer '303, demultiplexes the incoming bit stream and routes the multiple streams, to individual CDi decoders which decompress the bit stream according to the MPEG specification, and reproduce the multimedia program data for the user.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill the art, to combine the DRM capabilities as taught by Lacy '98, as disclosed by Iverson '664, to the streaming media player of Huizer '303 as described above. Furthermore, it would have been necessary to include a demultiplexer, a decompression unit, and a rendering unit as taught by Huizer '303 since these parts are integral to the disclosed streaming media player. As such, it would have been obvious and necessary to add DRM capabilities as taught by Lacy '98, as disclosed by Iverson '664, to the streaming media player of Huizer '303, including its integral demultiplexer, decompression unit, and rendering unit. Thus Claim 2 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a).

Regarding Claim 3 Huizer '303, Iverson '664, and Lacy '98 teach all the limitations of Claim 2 as described above.

Additionally, Iverson '664 teaches an embodiment of multimedia data control access that incorporates a stream controller that decrypts parts of the bit substream (column 7, lines 30-40; Iverson '664) which is an additional limitation recited by Claim 3.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill the art, to combine the DRM capabilities as taught by Lacy '98, as disclosed by Iverson '664, to the streaming media player of Huizer '303 as described above. Furthermore, it would have been necessary to include a stream controller that decrypts parts of the bit substream as taught by Iverson '664 since these parts are integral to the disclosed multimedia data control access invention. As such, it would have been obvious and necessary to add DRM capabilities as taught by Lacy '98, as disclosed by Iverson '664 including the integral stream controller that decrypts parts of the bit substream, to the streaming media player of Huizer '303. Thus Claim 3 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a).

Regarding Claim 4, Huizer '303, Iverson '664, and Lacy '98 teach all the limitations of Claim 3 as described above.

Additionally, Iverson '664 teaches a mechanism for forwarding a key from the control arrangement to the stream controller for decrypting purposes (column 7, line 40 to column 8, line 2; Iverson '664) which is an additional limitation recited by for Claim 4.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill the art, to combine the DRM capabilities as taught by Lacy '98, as disclosed by Iverson '664, to the streaming media player of Huizer '303 as described above. Furthermore, it would have been necessary to include a mechanism for forwarding a key from the control arrangement to the stream controller for decrypting purposes as taught by Iverson '664

Art Unit: 2171

since these parts are integral to the disclosed multimedia data control access invention. As such, it would have been obvious and necessary to add DRM capabilities as taught by Lacy '98, as disclosed by Iverson '664 including the integral mechanism for forwarding a key from the control arrangement to the stream controller for decrypting purposes, to the streaming media player of Huizer '303. Thus Claim 4 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a).

Regarding Claim 5, Huizer '303, Iverson '664, and Lacy '98 teach all the limitations of Claim 4 as described above.

Additionally, Huizer '303 teaches a feedback loop from the rendering unit to the control arrangement to determine what data has been rendered and what has not (column 5, lines 50-60; Huizer '303) which is which is an additional limitation recited by Claim 5. Specifically, Huizer '303 teaches using a switch to rotate through multiple bit streams and thus controlling which streams are rendered by a CDi decoder and when. Thus the invention inherently has the ability to determine the precise point up to where a particular stream has been rendered.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill the art, to combine the DRM capabilities as taught by Lacy '98, as disclosed by Iverson '664, to the streaming media player of Huizer '303 as described above. Furthermore, it would have been necessary to include a feedback loop indicating the point a bit stream has been rendered as taught by Huizer '303 since this part is integral to the disclosed multimedia data control access invention. As such, it would have been obvious and necessary to add DRM capabilities as taught by Lacy '98, as disclosed by Iverson '664 including the

integral mechanism for forwarding a key from the control arrangement to the stream controller for decrypting purposes, to the streaming media player of Huizer '303. Thus Claim 4 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a).

Regarding Claim 6, Huizer '303, Iverson '664, and Lacy '98 teach all the limitations of Claim 1 as described above.

Huizer '303 teaches the use of the MPEG transport but not a fully MPEG compliant data stream. Instead, Huizer '303 teaches the use of a CDi data stream. (column 5, line 65 to column 6, line 6; Huizer '303).

However, Lacy '98 teaches the use of an MPEG-4 stream (page 3, figure 2 and supporting text).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill the art, to combine the DRM capabilities as taught by Lacy '98, as disclosed by Iverson '664, to the streaming media player of Huizer '303 as described above. Furthermore, it would have been necessary to substitute an MPEG-4 decoder for the CDi decoder in the Huizer '303 apparatus in order to create an MPEG video standards compliant implementation and thus create a more diverse market for the invention as motivated by the teachings of Lacy '98. Moreover, since the transport protocol is the same and only the payload data would be substituted, no non-obvious or unexpected effects would be observed by such a substitution. As such, it would have been obvious and necessary to add DRM capabilities as taught by Lacy '98, as disclosed by Iverson '664, to the streaming media player of Huizer '303 with the CDi decoder substituted by an MPEG-4 decoder as taught by Lacy '98. Thus Claim 6 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a).

Regarding Claim 22, Huizer '303, Iverson '664, and Lacy '98 teach all the limitations of Claim 1 as described above.

Lacy '98 teaches that the implementation must be done in a "tamper-resistant manner" (page 6, lines 11-12; Lacy '98). Furthermore, the Iverson '664 multimedia data control access discloses features to "make it more difficult for someone to circumvent the decode access control scheme" (column 8, lines 2-6; Iverson '664).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill the art, to combine the DRM capabilities as taught by Lacy '98, as disclosed by Iverson '664, to the streaming media player of Huizer '303 as described above. Furthermore, it would have been necessary to include features making the implementation tamper-resistant as disclosed by Iverson '664 since these parts are integral to the disclosed multimedia data control access invention. Moreover, such tamper-resistant feature or further motivated by the teachings of Lacy '98. As such, it would have been obvious and necessary to add DRM capabilities as taught by Lacy '98, as disclosed by Iverson '664 including the integral tamper-resistant features, to the streaming media player of Huizer '303. Thus Claim 22 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a).

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huizer '303, Iverson '664, Lacy '98, and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,694,332 issued to Maturi (Maturi '332).

Regarding Claim 7, Huizer '303, Iverson '664, and Lacy '98 teach all the limitations of Claim 1 as described above.

Huizer '303 teaches the use of the MPEG transport but not a fully MPEG I Level III (MP3) compliant data stream. Instead, Huizer '303 teaches the use of a CDi data stream. (column 5, line 65 to column 6, line 6; Huizer '303).

However, Maturi '332 teaches the use of an arbitrary audio stream (page 3, figure 2 and supporting text) and is explicitly inclusive of MP3 data (column 3, lines 42-46; Maturi '332).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill the art, to combine the DRM capabilities as taught by Lacy '98, as disclosed by Iverson '664, to the streaming media player of Huizer '303 as described above. Furthermore, it would have been necessary to substitute the MP3 decoder of Maturi '332 for the CDi decoder in the Huizer '303 apparatus in order to create an MP3 audio standards compliant implementation and thus create a more diverse market for the invention. Moreover, both MP3 and CDi use the MPEG transport protocol and only the payload data would be substituted, no non-obvious or unexpected effects would be observed by such a substitution. As such, it would have been obvious and necessary to add DRM capabilities as taught by Lacy '98, as disclosed by Iverson '664, to the streaming media player of Huizer '303 with the CDi decoder substituted by an MP3 decoder as taught by Maturi '332. Thus Claim 7 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a).

Claim 26 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Iverson '664, in view of Lacy '98, in view of publication "How Plug-Ins 'Plug In,'" by Mark R.

Brown, 1996 (Brown '96), as referenced in the IDS received 12 May 2003, and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,794,038 issued to Stutz et al. (Stutz '038).

Iverson '664 explicitly teaches the following limitations of Claim 26: a receiving port for an encrypted bit stream and (column 7, lines 23-29; Iverson '664), and a control arrangement is able to decompress and decrypt the bit stream (column 7, lines 1-9 and column 7, line 23 to column 8, line 2; Iverson '664).

Iverson '664 does not explicitly teach the following limitations: decompression of the bit stream, a plug in embodiment, nor the separation of functionality across multiple plug-ins.

Lacy '98 teaches a streaming media client able to receive and render encrypted MPEG-4 encoded content (page 4, lines 19-24; Lacy '98) and thus teaches combining encryption with decompression.

Brown '96 teaches use of a plug-in embodiment for streaming media applications (page 18, lines 11-20; Brown '96).

Finally Stutz '038 teaches the separation of functionality across multiple plug-ins (column 30, lines 3-38; Stutz '038)

To incorporate the processing of MPEG-4 data by Lacy '98, with the decryption invention disclosed by Iverson '664, and to create a plug-in embodiment as disclosed by Brown '96, and further to create an embodiment in which functionality is separated across multiple plug-ins as disclosed by Stutz '038 would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention by the applicant as the



combination of the same is inherently necessary and explicitly taught therein as will be demonstrated below.

The motivation to use MPEG-4 data with encryption is explicitly taught by Lacy '98 as follows: "Consider a server that will deliver encrypted MPEG-4 encoded content ... to an authorized MPEG-4 client" (page 4, lines 19-20; Lacy '98). Note that MPEG-4 data is inherently compressed data and thus it would have been necessary to combine decompression with the decryption invention disclosed by Iverson '664.

The motivation to implement the Iverson '664/Lacy '98 decryption/decompression combination in a plug-in embodiment is explicitly taught by Brown '98 as follows: "Plug-ins are a godsend for applications developers, who can extend the utility of existing products into the burgeoning Internet market by developing a quick and easy NETSCAPE (TM) plug-in that reads existing data files, instead of developing a whole new product. Not only does this save developers time and effort, it lets them ride into a huge market riding on the coattails of NETSCAPE (TM) ..." (page 18, lines 11-20; Brown '96). Thus, one would have been motivated to create a plug-in embodiment of the Iverson '664/Lacy '98 decryption/decompression combination by the desire to extend the market reach of the combination.

The motivation to implement the Iverson '664/Lacy '98/Brown '96 decryption/decompression plug-in by separating functionality across multiple plug-ins would occur from a desire to reduce run-time overhead (column 7, lines 15-27; Stutz '038). Specifically, when a software service, such as decrypting/decompressing a bit stream, is dependent on multiple possible embodiments, such as MPEG-4 and MP3, a

standard approach is to create a first object responsible for determining which embodiment is required, and then to delegate processing to a second specializing object. In this way, an object that is not required is never instantiated, and thus does not create run time overhead. As applied to the aforementioned example, if the bit stream was an MPEG-4 bitstream, the first object would determine that a MPEG-4 decrypting/decompression object would have to be instantiated, would then instantiate it, and then would delegate processing to it. In doing so, any other objects not required would not be instantiated in the first place, and thus would save run-time resources. Thus it would have been desirable and obvious to apply the Stutz '038 teaching of separating functionality across multiple plug-ins to the Iverson '664/Lacy '98/Brown '96 decryption/decompression plug-in combination. Thus Claim 26 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a).

### ***Conclusion***

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Koenen, Rob, "Intellectual Property Management and Protection in MPEG Standards", ISO/IEC JTC1/SC29/WG11 N3943, January 2001 (Pisa). This item, while published past the filing date of the application, provides an excellent overview of DRM/IPMP requirements for an MPEG-4 player.
- Kahn, Robert and Wilensky Robert, "A Framework for Distributed Digital Object Services," <<http://www.cnri.reston.va.us/home/cstr/arch/k-w.html>>,

May 13, 1995. This paper provides a fundamental overview of the kinds of services and implementations that one would expect in a digital rights management system.

- EPO Patent Publication No. 0 674 440 A2 issued to Kangas, "A process for encryption and decryption of a bit stream containing digital information."  
Provides an encryption/decryption stream of an arbitrary bit stream (including MPEG-4 and MP3 data even when modified with DRM data)
- U.S. Patent No. 5,715,403 issued to Stefik, "System for Controlling the Distribution and Use of Digital Works Having Attached Usage Rights Where the Usage Rights are Defined by a Usage Rights Grammar." This patent provides a basic patent on a method of affixing digital rights information to data. This method would apply to an arbitrary bit stream.
- Plug-In Guide, Netscape Corporation,  
<<http://developer.netscape.com/docs/manuals/communicator/plugin/index.htm>> Copyrighted 1997. Provides detailed internal information on Plug-Ins for Netscape Navigator/Communicator.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Patrick J. D. Santos whose telephone number is 703-305-0707. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00-4:30.

Art Unit: 2171

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Safet Metjahic can be reached on 703-308-1436. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

pjs

  
SAFET METJAHIC  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100